Statement

Hydro-Electric/Multipurpose Schemes of Kerala Returned for Resubmission

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	Installed Capacity (MW)	Estimated Cost (Rs.Crs.)	Date of Return of DPR	Remarks
1.	Kerala Bhawani	3x50=150	168.75 (1991PL)	January 1992	Involves inter-State aspect. Located in Cauvery basin.
2.	Mananthwady (Multipurpose)	4x60=240	69.17 (Power) (1980 PL)	July 1980	Involves inter-State aspects. Located in Cauvery basin.
3.	Pambar	2x15=30	65.46 (1989 PL)	March 1990	Involves inter-State aspects. Located in Cauvery basin.
4.	Kuttiyadi Augmentation	2x50=100	61.72	May 1992	Involvest inter-State aspect. Located in Cauvery basin.
5.	Pandiar Punnapuzha	2x35=70	22.0	July 1982	Involves inter-State aspect with Tamil Nadu.
6.	Barapole	2x3+2x1.5=9	12.7	August 1991	Involves inter-state aspect with Karnataka
7.	Pallivasal Rehabilitation	3x20=60	45.48	April 1992	Due to major change in scope of works suggested by CEA/CWC.
8.	Karapara-Kunarkutty (Multipurpose)	2x2+ 3x20=84	85.64 (1990PL)	May 1991 (by CWC)	The Project has to be approved by TAC of Ministry of Water Resources (MOWR) in first instance.
	TOTAL:	743 MW			

Hirma Power Project

1571. SHRI SURESH PACHOURI: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) the present status of Hirma Power Project;

(b) whether Hirma is likely not to have buyers for its power; and

(c) if so, details of arrangements being made to ensure financial viability of the project?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRIMATI JAYAWANTI MEHTA): (a) In December, 2001, M/s. Mirant Asia Pacific Limited (MAPL) (formerly known as Southern Energy Asia-Pacific Limited), one of the Developers with whom Power Trading Corporation of India Limited (PTCIL) had signed the Development Agreement for the 3960 MW Hirma Mega Power Project in Orissa, announced their withdrawal from development of the project. M/s. Reliance Power Limited (RPL), the other co-developer, have shown interest to continue developing the project. The petition filed by MAPL before the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC) for review of the latters tariff order issued in September, 2000 has been dismissed by CERC vide its order dated April 29, 2002. CERC, in its order, has also observed that the tariff decided by the Commission in its orders of 5.9.2000 and 26.9.2000 cannot be revived, which has lapsed by efflux of time.

(b) and (c) Financial viability of the project would depend upon the competitiveness of tariff and an acceptable Payment Security Mechanism. The following States had agreed to off-take power from the Hirma project:

Rajasthan	-	1200 MW
Punjab	-	960 MW
Gujarat	-	700 MW
Madhya Pradesh	-	600 MW
Haryana	-	500 MW

PTCIL has been negotiating with the off-taking States for finalization of the Power Purchase Agreements. However, the Payment Security Mechanism for mitigating the payment risks has been a major issue in view of the present financial condition of SEBs/Utilities.

Requirement of Power in U.P. and Delhi

†1572. PROF. M.M. AGARWAL: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to **state**:

(a) the requirement of power in Uttar Pradesh and Delhi during the year 2002-2003;

(b) the quantum of power being produced by the existing power plants in the said states;

†Original notice of the Question was received in Hindi.